

comprising an off-road mode. The first and second operational modes according to the present invention are not selective according to switches as disclosed by Person. However, the present invention is broader than the difference between various operational modes being selected by switches. Applicants contend that the present invention as recited in claims 3 and 4 is very different from Person. Accordingly, the anticipation rejection of claims 3 and 4 should be withdrawn.

Regarding claim 5, Person does not disclose an on-road or an off-road mode. Accordingly, Person does not anticipate claim 5.

Claims 3, 5 and 6, dependent on claim 4 should be patentable for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 4 as well as on their own merits.

Regarding claims 7 and 8, Person does not disclose a first and second operational mode. Person does not disclose two operational modes in Figure 4. Operational modes refers to the operational mode of the vehicle, that is, where it is located rather than the operational mode of selecting which features are going to be displayed. The reference to column 3, lines 5-12 appears to be irrelevant to the present invention.

Regarding claim 9, again Person does not disclose two operational modes for the system. Again, column 3, lines 5-12 appear to be irrelevant to claim 9.

Claim 11 again requires two operational modes. This is not disclosed in Person. Person has a switch rather than a different mode for display intensity. Again claim 11 is not anticipated by Person.

Regarding claims 12-15, these claims were allowable for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 11 from which they dependent.

Regarding claim 17 again this claim is not anticipated by Person because claim 17 requires two operational modes.

Claim 18 is patentable for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 17 as well as on its own merits.

Claim 20-24 are patentable for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 17 as well as on its own merits.

Claims 25-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Ito (U.S. Patent No. 6,249,740B1). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claim 25 requires different cartographic entities for different cartographic features and have different intensities which were displayed simultaneously. One of the cartographic entities is the focal point of the display. Person does not disclose this.

Claims 26-30 are patentable for the reasons discussed with respect to claim 25 as well as on their own merits.

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application should be in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 07-1337 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

LOWE HAUPTMAN GILMAN & BERNER, LLP



Kenneth M. Berner
Registration No. 37,093

Date: April 29, 2003
1700 Diagonal Road, Suite 310
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
Telephone: (703) 684-1111
Facsimile: (703) 518-5499
KMB:JD